

I support only a portion of the changes proposed in RM-10867. Since it has been demonstrated that it is possible for very young children to successfully obtain a Technician class license, I disagree with the notion that the Technician class exam is "overly comprehensive in its subject matter." Besides, if phone or other limited HF privileges were extended to entry level individuals, I would think a comprehensive examination is what should be required. I further disagree that it is because of limited VHF/UHF contacts that people with Technician class licences are discouraged in advancing themselves to a higher license class. I was motivated myself to advance my license class through self education, including morse code, with the goal being the ability to obtain HF privileges. I now have an Extra class license which I am proud of. If worldwide, or at least beyond local repeater communications is desired, those with Technician licenses still have access to satellites, and the cost of reasonable satellite communications equipment is no different than the added expense of a full HF station. I don't believe refarming HF band segments is necessary either. It is my understanding that just because there are Novice/Tech. Plus segments designated within the HF bands, it doesn't preclude anyone else with a higher license class from using them. I also don't believe in blindly combining different license classes together, without administering the proper examinations, just to keep the number of licenses at three in order to introduce yet another new Novice class. My suggestion would be to keep both the Technician and Extra class licenses as is. However, if opening up the HF bands to more operators is the goal, drop the morse code requirement from the General class license, and naturally eliminate CW as an operating mode for new General class licensees, but preserve the CW, RTTY, and Data band segments, as well as the voluntary band plans organized by the ARRL which are currently in place.